

REMARKS

Claims 56-82 are pending prior to entering this amendment. The examiner rejects claims 56-59 and 63-66 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as anticipated by Levine (US Patent Application No. 2005/0015443) and Lopponen (US Patent Application No. 2002/0150091). The examiner rejects claims 60-62, 67-69 and 74-76 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Levine and Chan, et al (US Patent No. 6,505,300).

Applicant amends claims 56, 63, and 70. Claims 56-82 remain after entering this amendment. Applicant adds no new matter and requests reconsideration.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The examiner rejects claims 56-59 and 63-66 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as anticipated by Levine and Lopponen. The examiner rejects claims 60-62, 67-69 and 74-76 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Levine and Chan.

Claim 56 recites *automatically generating the desired group to include the first group and exclude the second group according to the received definition of the desired group*. Claims 63, 70, and 77 recites similar features.

Applicant agrees with the examiner that Levine does not teach or suggest generating any group to include one defined group of users and exclude another defined group of users. Nothing in Lopponen, however, cures this deficiency, as Lopponen discloses a group management application 64 that grants certain users (group managing users 61) the ability to individually admit and deny ordinary users admission to pre-generated groups, not including or excluding whole pre-defined groups of users as the claims require.

The inclusion and exclusion of entire groups when generating a desired group is distinctly different than Lopponen's ad hoc admission or denial of individual users to a newly created group. See, Lopponen, paragraphs [0140]-[0141], where Lopponen creates groups and opens them up for users to apply for membership. Since there is no disclosure in Lopponen of any group managing user 61 creating a group that has a membership of users solely defined by whether the users are members of other groups, the combination of Levine and Lopponen do not anticipate claims 56, 63, 70, and 77 or there corresponding dependent claims.

In an attempt to clear some ambiguity, the applicant has further amended the claims to clarify that the recited first and second groups of users are actually generated groups, not just users who were accepted into or denied from a desired group when they individually applied or received an invitation. For instance, claim 56 further recites *automatically generating the first group having the first plurality of users according to the definition of the first group and automatically generating the second group having the second plurality of users according to the definition of the second group*. Claims 63, 70, and 77 recites similar features.

There is no disclosure in Levine or Lopponen of generating any group by specifically including and excluding other generated groups. See, Lopponen, paragraphs [0140]-[0141], where the Lopponen includes or excludes users on an individual basis, not based on which groups they belong. Since, neither Levine, nor Lopponen teach or suggest generating a desired group from a definition that specifically includes or excludes other defined and generated groups, Levine and Lopponen do not anticipate claims 56, 63, 70, and 77 or there corresponding dependent claims.

Applicant further notes that the examiner has failed to meet a *prima facie* case for obviousness by failing to disclose any motivation, suggestion, or reason to combine Levine and Lopponen. Applicant also would like to point out that the finality of the instant Office Action appears to be premature as the applicant did not amend independent claim 77 in the previous response and the examiner found a new reference (Lopponen) and used a new ground of rejection on claim 77. Applicant respectfully requests that the examiner clearly delineate the rejection to claims 77-82, as it is unclear to applicant what grounds (102 or 103) the examiner was utilizing.

Claim 57 recites *the definition of the first group or the second group identifies one or more properties shared by the users in the first group or the second group and dynamically generating the first group or the second group according to the received definition*. Claims 64, 70 and 78 recite similar features. Applicant presented this argument in the previous Office Action response, which was not addressed by the examiner. Applicant respectfully requests that the examiner address applicant's argument and clarify the rejection, or allow the claims.

The examiner alleges Levine discloses the recited limitations at paragraph [0125]. Paragraph [0125], however, discusses the ability of subscribers 4 to manage a group

that has already been created. There is no disclosure in paragraph [0125] or anywhere in Levine of a definition of a first or second group that identifies at least one shared property of the subscribers 4, much less generating the first or second group according to the definition. Since Levine does not teach or suggest generating the first or second group according to a definition that identifies at least one shared property of the subscribers 4, Levine does not anticipate claims 57, 64, 71, and 78.

Claim 82 recites *a processing system ... to manage security of communications over a network according to at least one of the desired group or the plurality of groups, the processing to manage security of communications over a network by associating one or more network security privileges or resources accessible on the network with the desired group or the plurality of groups.*

Applicant previously amended claim 82 to clarify that management of network security of communications over a network to include associating one or more network security privileges or resources accessible on the network with the desired group or the plurality of groups. Nothing in Levine nor Lopponen teaches or suggests associating network security privileges on the network to any group or to associate resources accessible on the network to any group, nor do Levine and Lopponen provide any motivation or reason to associate these attributes with an entire group.

Since the recited network security privileges and resource accessibility on a network are distinctly different than user's rights to become a member of a group, as the examiner argues, Levine and Lopponen therefore does not anticipate claim 82.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that all claims are allowable and ask the examiner to pass this application to allowance. If the examiner has any questions or believes that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, applicants encourage the examiner to call the undersigned at (503) 224-2170.

Customer No. 73552

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP

/ Jeffrey J. Richmond /

Jeffrey J. Richmond

Reg. No. 57,564

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP

621 SW Morrison Street

Suite 600

Portland, OR 97205

503-224-2170